

OBLON SPIVAK **McClelland** MAIER **NEUSTADT** P.C.

Docket No.: 0557-4909-3

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

GREGORY J. MAIER (703) 413-3000 GMAIER@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 09/498,375

CHRISTOPHER D. WARD

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of \$-0- is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record

Registration No. 25,599

Christopher D. Ward

Registration No. 41,367

James D. Hamilton Registration No. 28,421

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413-2220

GJM/CDW/JD: 95955 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ■ FOURTH FLOOR ■ ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202 ■ U.S.A. I:\atty\Jd\0557\05574909.rest-**q**\atty\d\0557\05574909.rest-**q**\atty\Delta\restriction: 703-413-2220 ■ www.oblon.com

0557-4909-3

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

OCT 0 9 2007

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Kazunori ITO, et al.

: EXAMINER: EVANS, E.

SERIAL NO: 09/498,375

FILED: FEBRUARY 4, 2000

: GROUP: 1774

FOR: OPTICAL DEVICE SUBSTRATE FILM-FORMATION ...

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS WASHINGTON, DC 20231

SIR:

In response to the Restriction and Election of Species Requirement dated September 4, 2001, Applicants elects with traverse Group I, Claims 1-42 and 73. The Applicants make this election based on the understanding that the Applicants are not prejudice against filing one or more divisional applications that cover non-elected claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement.

MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. For example, the Official Action indicates that the apparatus of Group I and the apparatus of Group II both fall under Class 369. Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully traverse the outstanding restriction requirement on the grounds that a search and

examination of the entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-42 and 73 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record

Registration No: 25,599 Christopher D. Ward Registration No: 41,367

James D. Hamilton Registration No. 28,421

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413-2220 GJM/CDW/JD:ys

I:\atty\Jd\0557\05574909.restriction.wpd